

### EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Jill Poinboeuf on 3-9-2009. Jill Poinboeuf (Reg. No.: 62086) is an IBM "in house" attorney and is the current Attorney of record as confirmed by Mollie Lettang (Reg. No.: 48405), the previous attorney of record and by IBM in house counsel representative Doug Lashmith.

The application has been amended as follows:

Replace claim 1 (claim 17 from 5-13-2004) with:

--

1. *A computer-readable storage medium, comprising:  
a first software component, implemented in Java Swing, adapted to create a graphical representation of an object embodied as code within the software component, wherein the code comprises text and other displayable content;  
an application program running under an operating system; and  
a second software component adapted for drawing the text, wherein the first software component is invoked during runtime by the application program to define visual attributes of the text, but not to draw the text, and wherein the*

*second software component is invoked to draw the text using the visual attributes;*

*a lightweight peer component, that borrows resources from a platform specific ancestor, adapted for redirecting a memory call to invoke text drawing methods of the second software component rather than text drawing methods of the first software component; and*

*wherein the first software component is used for drawing the graphical representation of the object on the display screen, and wherein the second software component is used for drawing the text upon the graphical representation of the object.*

--

#### **REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

1. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:
2. The examiner considered the Decision on Appeal rendered March 31, 2008 and the Examiner's Answer of 3-9-2009 and after updated search, no other prior art of record has taught that which was presented in the amended claims
3. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.
4. Independent claim 1 when considered as a whole, is allowable over the prior art of record (Nelson). Nelson teaches, a software component that creates a graphical representation of a object, where a graphical representation is rendered, comprising text and other displayable content (see page 694 and 697), an application program creating

a graphical representation under an operating system (see page 20 paragraph 1 and page 39), a second software component adapted for drawing text (see page 472), and this second software invoked to draw text using only visual attributes, i.e. static text (see page 472). Nelson further teaches on page 78, UI class having separate groups of code to get the look-and-feel, and to draw the text, it teaches a UI class that doesn't know what the text control contains or what the contents should look like, but uses `getDocument()` or `getStyledDocument()` methods. Nelson teaches, on page 694, a graphical representation of the text, and further teaches on page 472, and on page 78, a second software component used to draw the text defined by another software component. Nelson teaches, on pages 694, 697, 472, and on page 72, a system for drawing text where one component can define attributes of an item and the actual displaying of the item can be implemented by another item. However, specifically the prior art of record fails to clearly teach or support the limitations of *a first software component implemented in Java Swing that defines the visual attributes of the text does not draw the text, relying on a lightweight peer component that borrows resources from a platform specific ancestor, adapted for redirecting a memory call to invoke text drawing methods of the second software component rather than text drawing methods of the first software component*

5. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DENNIS G. BONSHOCK whose telephone number is (571)272-4047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 6:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on (571) 272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dennis G. Bonshock/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173  
3-10-09  
dgb